

that the committee amendment is substantially the same as the first part of the bill. The bill had to do with driving under the influence of drugs, as well as alcohol. But the drugs part of it has been taken out of the committee amendments. The committee amendment becomes the bill, but the committee amendment is substantially the same as the first part of Senator Abboud's bill. So it has been the wish of the Transportation Committee to take out the perhaps more controversial part of the bill which had to do with testing for drugs with drivers who are seemingly under the influence of drugs. So it is strictly an alcohol bill at this point. A recent Supreme Court decision has made it imperative that this sort of bill be passed. So I would move the committee amendment, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Abboud is next, but may I introduce a couple of guests that we have this morning. Under the south balcony we have Mr. Erion Friehe who is the past president of the National Wheat Growers from McCook, Nebraska. Will you please stand. Thank you, Erion. Also we have Mrs. Evelyn Ramirez who is the mother of Lisa, our Page, from Gering, Nebraska. She is a guest of Senator Weihing. She is under the south balcony also. Would you please welcome her to the session. Thank you, Evelyn, for coming this morning, we appreciate it. Glad to see you. Senator Abboud, please.

SENATOR ABOUD: Mr. President, I rise to support the committee amendment. The bill originally dealt with two particular parts, the first part is what this bill deals with at this particular time, strictly setting up the three standards, three per se standards for levels of alcohol. The second part dealt with drug testing for individuals requiring that individuals give an implied consent, when they receive their drivers license, for drug testing. If they are pulled over and they are clearly intoxicated there would have been a requirement for that individual to take a urine test for drugs. But because of the recent Supreme Court case which came down approximately two weeks ago, *State v. Burling*, the committee felt that it was wise just to proceed and expedite this bill and deal strictly with the area dealing with implied consent that an individual will have to take...will have to take a test for alcohol and that test can make use of the existing standard of a breathalyzer. Currently with this particular bill, or with the law as it is, after the *Burling* case, they can still...there is still the implied consent that an individual has to be tested for alcohol if they are clearly intoxicated or physically appear intoxicated. But this bill allows for those officers to test